**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Background

Writing is an important part of language learning. In relation to writing skills Alqurashi (2015) states that writing is one of the most important skills that the students of English as a second language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) need to develop in order to enhance their efforts to learn the target language and elevate their second language. Moreover writing is essentially a reflective activity that requires enough time to think about the specific topic and to analyze and classify any background knowledge. Baghzou (2014) explains that writers need suitable language to structure the ideas in the form of a coherent discourse. Learners have to link and develop information, ideas, or arguments in logical sequences. Without writing practice, students have difficulty in achieving clarity, which is the goal of any writing exercise.

Learning to write follows a sequential process. The writing process should be an ongoing cycle in every writing classroom. Students should be engaged in prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing Newkirk & Miller (2009). Going through those process of writing, Zahreil & Rahnama (2013) believes that it is quite common for learners to make errors and for teachers to correct learners errors . In that process the students need to have some responds from the teacher toward their writings.

In regard with responding students writing Alqurashi (2015) found that the participants in his study asserted that they thought carefully about the teacher’s comments and corrections which might be taken as an indication that those students considered their teacher response a great help to gain confidence in themselves as good writers. In addition, they mentioned that they paid more attention to teacher response on both surface-level errors and meaning-level errors. This was perhaps due to response effectiveness in helping them produce better writing with less mistakes. The participants also mentioned that all types of teacher response were important to them which could indicate positive attitudes toward such response on their writing and its role in developing the necessary skills to improve their writing proficiency.

One way to respond to students written work is by giving them corrective feedback. Purnawarman (2011) explains that in language learning and language instruction, including writing in English as a second or foreign Language context, the vital role of feedback in students’ learning is evident. Student writers gain benefits from sufficient writing practice and revisions on their drafts to produce a final piece of writing. In these processes, student writers often rely on feedback either from a teacher, peer, or self. Feedback that students receive from a source, or a combination of sources, provides them with information about what is good and what needs to be improved so that they can incorporate and use the feedback in their revisions and in the final product of their writing. In accordance with the explanation, Simpson (2006) adds that many researchers and teachers believe that grammatical correction of some kind is necessary when responding to student writing. As teacher the researcher even believes and feels obligated to correct grammatical errors in their learners’ written work. By this way the students will see that their works get attention from the teacher.

Still about responding to students’ writing, Sommer (1982) claims more specifically, that teachers respond on student writing because the teachers believe that it is necessary to offer assistance to student writers when they are in the process of composing a text, rather than after the text has been completed. Comments create the motive for doing something different in the next draft; thoughtful comments create the motive for revising. Without comments from their teachers or from their peers, student writers will revise in a consistently narrow and predictable way. Furthermore the teachers comment on student writing help the students to evaluate what they have written and develop control over their writing.

Whether  teachers  should  correct  errors  produced  by  learners  in  their foreign or second language has been an issue for years Wen Kao(2013). Dealing to the issue some scholars have investigated about the effect of error correction on students writing. Among those scholars who have examined the effectiveness of corrective feedback on student writing came with different findings. Truscott (1996) for example, in his previous study found that correction had little or no effect on students' writing abilityand that written corrective feedback is actually ineffective and harmful for learners and teachers. He also states that it causes stress and demotivates learners. Pan (2010) also counducted a research on the effect of teacher error correction on the accuracy of EFL students writing and found that there is no positive relationship between teacher error feedback and students’ improvement in linguistic accuracy over time was observed.

In spite of the above investigation, a large number of studies have also examined the effectiveness of corrective feedback on student writing. Most of the studies found that feedback are helpful and effective in improving student writing. Ferris (2007 ) who has strong arguments against truscott (1996) claimed that corrective feedback is valuable in promoting greater grammatical accuracy. Some other researchers were also interested in investigating teachers and students perception toward error correction on the writings.Bitchener & Knoch (2008) carried out ten-month study to examine the effectiveness of written corrective feedback found that those who received written corrective feedback on the two functions outperformed the control group on all four post-tests. Lee (2003, 2008) investigated student reactions to teacher feedback and concluded that it is important for teachers to be aware of the impact of their feedback practices on student expectations and attitudes, which should be fed back to teachers to help them develop reﬂective and effective feedback practices. Chandler (2003) even broaden the study and found that both direct correction and simple underlining of errors are signiﬁcantly superior to describing the type of error, even with underlining, for reducing long-term error. Direct correction is best for producing accurate revisions, and students prefer it because it is the fastest and easiest way for them as well as the fastest way for teachers over several drafts. However, students feel that they learn more from selfcorrection, and simple underlining of errors takes less teacher time on the ﬁrst draft.

Most of recent studies on the effectiveness of teacher written corrective feedback put more attention on investigating the combination of direct vs indirect corrective feedback, Daneshvar & Rahimi (2014), Elashri (2013), Maleki (2013), Zareil & Rahnama (2013), Jamalinesari et al (2015) and Salimi and Ahmadpour (2015). The present study is also investigate the effects of direct and indirec corrective feedback with emphasis on analyzing how different types of errors made by the students surface on their subsequent writings.

1. Problem Statement

Based on the above explanation, researcher have done prior interview on some teachers at SMP Negeri 36 Makassar and other school whether they give written corrective feedback or not. Honestly they admitted that they rarely doing the correction. They just give students the writing score or provide the correct form before finishing the draft. Therefore there is no revison stage. By this way the teachers think that they have fulfilled the writing class as as the last session to be presented based on the syllabus. As a result there is no enough time to give correction on students writing. For students, correction that they get from their teacher is direct correction feedback but it does not give the students a chance to revise their writing before submitting revised version to the teacher for their final draft.

Therefore in conducting this study the researcher investigated the effects of direct and indirect coded written corrective feedback on students’ writing of the ninth grade students of SMP Negeri 36 Makassar in academic year 2015/2016. This research concerns on types of errors made by the students who have direct and indirect corrective feedback on their subsequent writing.

Referring to the above background the researher formulated the following research questions as follows :

1. Does direct corrective feedback improve the quality of students’ writing?
2. Does indirect coded corrective feedback improve the quality of students’ writing?
3. What kind of corrective feedback (direct or indirect coded corrective feedback) is most effective in regard to the improvement of students’ writing?
4. Objectives of the Research

The objectives of the research are as follows:

1. To investigate the effects of direct corrective feedback in improving the quality of students’ writing.
2. To investigate the effects of indirect coded corrective feedback in improving the quality students’ writing.
3. To investigate the most effective corrective feedback in regard to the improvement of students’ writing.
4. Significance of the Research

The result of this research is expected to have a geat deal of contribution theoretically and practically to English laguage teaching and learning process especially in teaching and learning of writing. Theoretically, it is hoped that corrective feedback can overcome the occurence of error and avoid repeating mistakes which can lead them to revise their writing and finally will improve students writing. Practically, the students will have a meaningful learning process and for teachers giving necessary correction for feedback can help to diagnose students problematic areas and therefore will focuses some attention on the students weaknesses.

1. Scope of the Research

The scope of the research was limited by the effects of teacher corrective feedback on students’ writing of ninth grade students of SMP Negeri 36 Makassar academic year 2015/2016. By discipline this research is under applied linguistic. By content this research investigated types of teacher corrective feedback proposed by Ellis (2008). This reseach apply direct and indirect coded corrective feedback. In the case of direct corrective feedback the teacher provides the student with the correct form. While indirect coded corrective feedback involves indicating that the student has made an error without actually correcting it. This is done by underlining the location of errors and using a code to show where the error has occurred and what type of error it is. There were 15 errors being identified on students draft based on the frequent errors made by the students of SMP Negeri 36 Makassar on their writing. This types of errors was also adapted from Harmer (2004) in Baghzou (2014). By activity the students wrote six different topics of recount text about their personal experiences.